

DAC
ZTW

PTO/SB/64 (07-05)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT
ABANDONED UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)**

Docket Number (Optional)

GREENS-46002

First named inventor: Mark David Heath

Application No.: 10/823,082

Art Unit:

Filed: 12 April 2004

Examiner:

Title: STRUCTURAL PANEL AND METHOD OF FABRICATION

Attention: Office of Petitions

Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FAX (571) 273-8300

NOTE: If information or assistance is needed in completing this form, please contact Petitions Information at (571) 272-3282.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to a notice or action by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The date of abandonment is the day after the expiration date of the period set for reply in the office notice or action plus an extensions of time actually obtained.

APPLICANT HEREBY PETITIONS FOR REVIVAL OF THIS APPLICATION

NOTE: A grantable petition requires the following items:

- (1) Petition fee;
- (2) Reply and/or issue fee;
- (3) Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee - required for all utility and plant applications filed before June 8, 1995; and for all design applications; and
- (4) Statement that the entire delay was unintentional.

1. Petition fee

☒ Small entity-fee \$ 750.00 (37 CFR 1.17(m)). Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27.

☐ Other than small entity - fee \$ _____ (37 CFR 1.17(m)).

2. Reply and/or fee

A. The reply and/or fee to the above-noted Office action in the form of a Response to Notice to File Missing Parts (identify type of reply):

- ☒ has been filed previously on 18 August 2005
☐ is enclosed herewith.

B. The issue fee and publication fee (if applicable) of \$ _____.

- ☐ has been paid previously on _____
☐ is enclosed herewith.

[Page 1 of 2]

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.137(b). The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.0 hour to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

09/20/2005 YPOLITE1 00000105 10823082

750.00 OP


01 FC:2453

3. Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee

- ☒ Since this utility/plant application was filed on or after June 8, 1995, no terminal disclaimer is required.
- ☐ A terminal disclaimer (and disclaimer fee (37 CFR 1.20(d)) of \$ _____ for a small entity or \$ _____ for other than a small entity) disclaiming the required period of time is enclosed herewith (see PTO/SB/63).

4. STATEMENT: The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. [NOTE: The United States Patent and Trademark Office may require additional information if there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional (MPEP 711.03(c), subsections (III)(C) and (D)).]

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

<p> _____ Signature</p> <p>_____ Scott W. Kelley Typed or printed name</p> <p>_____ 6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1650 Address</p> <p>_____ Woodland Hills, California 91367 Address</p>	<p>_____ 14 September 2005 Date</p> <p>_____ 30,762 Registration Number, if applicable</p> <p>_____ (818)347-7900 Telephone Number</p>
---	--


- Enclosures: ☒ Fee Payment
- ☐ Reply
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer Form
- ☐ Additional sheets containing statements establishing unintentional delay
- ☒ Other: Decision on Petition dated September 9, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☒ Deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☐ Transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office as (571) 273-8300.

 14 September 2005
 Date



 Signature

 Scott W. Kelley
 Typed or printed name of person signing certificate



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DW Sep-05

11.09.05
KELLY LOWRY & KELLEY, LLP
6320 CANOGA AVENUE
SUITE 1650
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367

RECEIVED

SEP 12 2005

KELLY LOWRY & KELLEY, LLP

COPY MAILED

SEP 09 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS



In re Application of :
Mark David Heath :
Application No. 10/823,082 : ON PETITION
Filed: 12 April, 2004 :
Atty Dckt No. GREENS-46002 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 22 August, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.137(a)¹ to revive the above-identified application which is first treated as a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

The petition is dismissed.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)" or

¹ A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed; In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(1);

(3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

"Renewed Petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment," or as discussed below "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)."

The application became abandoned on 25 August, 2004, for failure to timely file a response to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application mailed on 24 June, 2004, which set a two (2) month shortened period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 17 March, 2005.

Petitioner asserts unavoidable delay in that the Notice mailed on 24 June, 2004, was never received because it was sent to an incorrect correspondence address. Specifically, petitioner states that the application transmittal sheet inadvertently identified the correspondence address as Customer Number "2625" rather than "26252", and the Notice was mailed to the address associated with Customer Number 2625.

PETITION TO WITHDRAW THE HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

Petitioner asserts that the Office communication mailed on 24 June, 2004, was never received. A review of the record indicates no irregularity in the mailing of the Office action, and in the absence of any irregularity in the mailing, there is a strong presumption that the Office action was properly mailed to the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the Office action was not in fact received. The showing required to establish the failure to receive an Office action must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement.² The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office communication may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

²M.P.E.P. § 711.03(c); See Notice entitled "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 O.G. 53 (November 16, 1993).

A review of the record reveals that the Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application was mailed on 24 June, 2004, and was returned to the Office as undeliverable on 14 July, 2004. However, the showing of record is that the Office action was properly addressed to the address of Customer No. 2625, the Customer Number identified as the correspondence address on the Utility Patent Application Transmittal filed on 12 April, 2004. As such, the showing of record is that the USPTO properly mailed the Office action to the address provided by petitioner, but that the address provided by petitioner was incorrect. Failure to provide a proper correspondence address is not grounds for withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. As such, the showing is that there was no irregularity in the mailing of the Office action mailed on 24 June, 2004. Rather, petitioner failed to provide the Office with a proper correspondence address. As such, the failure to receive the Office action is the fault of petitioner and not that of the Office. As such, the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment is dismissed.

If petitioner has evidence that he attempted to provide the correct correspondence address to the Office prior to the mailing of the Office action mailed on 24 June, 2004, petitioner may wish to consider submitting said evidence with a renewed petition.

PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(a)

The Commissioner may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding Office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to be "unavoidable".³ Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or

³35 U.S.C. § 133.

imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.⁴

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).⁵ Specifically, an application is "unavoidably" abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, facsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office.⁶

As stated above, the showing of record is that the failure to receive the Office action mailed on 24 June, 2004, occurred because petitioner failed to provide a proper correspondence address with the application papers filed on 12 April, 2004. A delay caused by the failure on the part of petitioner, or petitioner's representative, to provide the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office with a current correspondence address does not constitute an unavoidable delay.⁷

As the showing of record is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), the petition will be dismissed.

ALTERNATIVE VENUE

⁴ In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

⁵ See MPEP 711(c) (III) (C) (2) for a discussion of the requirements for a showing of unavoidable delay.

⁶ Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887).

⁷ See Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 34 USPQ2d 1786 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), which now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after 8 June, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

✓(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

✓(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

X(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

The filing of a petition under the unintentional standard cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore should be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

Should petitioners decide to file a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), the additional petition fee due would be \$750.00 for a small entity.

A copy of the form for filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive an application unintentionally abandoned is enclosed herewith for petitioners' convenience.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: (571) 273-8300
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window
Mail Stop Petition
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

The correspondence address has been changed in accordance with the declaration submitted with the present petition.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: Form PTO/SB/64
Privacy Act Statement
